



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,236	07/01/2005	Bjorn Sahlberg	3782-026SPUS2	3830
2292 7590 06/10/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
SHU, HO T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2457				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/10/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/541,236

Applicant(s)

SAHLBERG ET AL.

Examiner

HO SHIU

Art Unit

2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 July 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/IC)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01 July 2005, 07 January 2009
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 5-15 and 19-29 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and/or cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Appropriate correction is required.
3. Claims 13 and 27 recite the word "organisations". The examiner suspects that this is simply a spelling mistake and it should read "organizations". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-14 and 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollstrom et al. (Wipo Pub # WO/2001/061449, hereinafter Holl) and in view of Gregg (US Pub # 2003/0046589, hereinafter Gregg) and in further**

view of Murphy et al (US Patent # 6,845,393, hereinafter Murphy) and in further view of Dinker et al. (US Pub # 2003/0177411, hereinafter Dinker) and in further view of official notice.

6. With respect to claim 1, Holl discloses a method of responding to a request for access to an application service, the application service being deployed in a system that associates a specific area of a position coded surface with an application service by means of an area address, the method including (pg. 1, [0005]): providing a first enterprise paper look-up service which manages a confined set of one or more enterprise application services associated with respective area addresses (pg. 1, [0005]); receiving, from an originator, a request including an area address (pg. 3, [0003]); checking, if the area address is associated with an enterprise application service managed by the first enterprise paper look-up service (abstract, pg. 1, [0005]), but does not clearly disclose that the originator of the request has the right to access the enterprise application service, before enabling access to the service; and routing, based on the area address, the request to a second paper look-up service if the area address is not associated with an enterprise application service managed by the first enterprise paper look-up service.

In the same field of endeavor, Gregg discloses in [0081], line 1-13, that if the session ID is not in the communication headers block, the client authenticator denies permission to the server application for servicing the account holder's request.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holl with the originator of the request has the right to access the enterprise application service, before enabling access to the service as taught in Gregg in order to reject usage of applications if they are not authorized. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings with one another in order to provide a more secure system by ensuring that only authorized users are allowed to utilize the applications they were allowed to use.

However, Holl and Gregg do not clearly disclose routing, based on the area address, the request to a second paper look-up service if the area address is not associated with an enterprise application service managed by the first enterprise paper look-up service.

In the same field of endeavor, Murphy discloses in col. 3, lines 25-65, that lookup discovery services in effect provide the capability for clients to maintain a more complete representation of available lookup services, and in turn, clients gain access to a more comprehensive collection of services.

In the same field of endeavor, Dinker discloses in the abstract that a primary application server computer in the cluster may become unavailable and a secondary application server has to be utilized.

The examiner takes official notice that since Murphy discloses that lookup discovery services in effect provide the capability for clients to maintain a more complete representation of available lookup services, and in turn, clients gain access to a more comprehensive collection of services, and Dinker discloses that a primary

application server computer in the cluster may become unavailable and a secondary application server has to be utilized, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have incorporated the teachings of Holl, Gregg, and Murphy with based on the area address, the request to a second paper look-up service if the area address is not associated with an enterprise application service managed by the first enterprise paper look-up service (if an area address is not associated with an application service, it means that the application service is unavailable). One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings with one another so a faster/more efficient system can be used without having to return an error message to the user in case the first server cannot supply the user/requestor with what they were requesting.

7. With respect to claim 2, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Dinker discloses in [0035] that a backup application server may backup the processing information managed by the primary application server.

However, Holl, Greg, Murphy, and Dinker do not clearly disclose wherein the routing step includes the step of selecting a second paper look-up service, among a plurality of paper look-up services, that is associated with the area address of the request.

The examiner takes official notice that since Dinker discloses that a backup application server may backup the processing information managed by the primary application server, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

would have incorporated the teachings of Holl, Gregg, and Murphy with wherein the routing step includes the step of selecting a second paper look-up service, among a plurality of paper look-up services, that is associated with the area address of the request. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings with one another so a faster/more efficient system can be used without having to return an error message to the user in case the first server cannot supply the user/requestor with what they were requesting.

8. With respect to claim 3, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Dinker discloses in [0061] that there are two backup servers to the primary application server. Dinker in [0062] discloses that the alternate application server having the highest priority may be promoted to the role of a backup application server (in which this is how the backup server is chosen).

However, Holl, Greg, Murphy, and Dinker do not clearly disclose wherein the selecting step is based on a step of matching the received area address with one of the area addresses which by the enterprise paper look-up service are associated with respective second paper look-up services.

The examiner takes official notice that since Dinker discloses that there are two backup servers to the primary application server and that the alternate application server having the highest priority may be promoted to the role of a backup application server, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have incorporated the teachings of Holl, Gregg, and Murphy with wherein the routing step

includes the step of selecting a second paper look-up service, among a plurality of paper look-up services, that is associated with the area address of the request. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings with one another since it is simply a design choice of how you want the system to choose which one will be the alternate/second server.

9. With respect to claim 4, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Dinker discloses in [0061] that there are two backup servers to the primary application server. Dinker in [0062] discloses that the alternate application server having the highest priority may be promoted to the role of a backup application server (in which this is how the backup server is chosen).

However, Holl, Greg, Murphy, and Dinker do not clearly disclose wherein the routing step includes the step of selecting a second paper look-up service that defines a default paper look-up service.

The examiner takes official notice that since Dinker discloses that there are two backup servers to the primary application server and that the alternate application server having the highest priority may be promoted to the role of a backup application server, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have incorporated the teachings of Holl, Gregg, and Murphy with wherein the routing step includes the step of selecting a second paper look-up service that defines a default paper look-up service. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings with one another since it is simply a design choice of how you want the

system to choose which one will be the alternate/second server.

10. With respect to claim 5, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Gregg discloses in [0081], line 1-13, that if the session ID is not in the communication headers block, the client authenticator denies permission to the server application for servicing the account holder's request.

However, Holl, Gregg, Murphy and Dinker do not clearly disclose including checking that the originator of the request has the right to cause routing of a request to the second paper look-up service, wherein said routing step only is completed if this right is confirmed.

The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holl, Gregg, Murphy, and Dinker with including checking that the originator of the request has the right to cause routing of a request to the second paper look-up service, wherein said routing step only is completed if this right is confirmed in order to reject usage of applications if they are not authorized. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings with one another in order to provide a more secure system by ensuring that only authorized users are allowed to utilize the applications they were allowed to use.

11. With respect to claim 6, Holl discloses receiving a response from paper look-up service; extracting information related to the application service associated with the area

address from the response (abstract, pg. 1, [0005]); and responding to the originator of the request by transferring said information to the originator (abstract, pg. 1, [0005]).

In addition, Dinker also discloses a second application server that can provide the services a user needs in case he first server is unavailable (abstract).

However, Holl, Gregg, Murphy, and Dinker do not clearly disclose receiving a response from the second paper look-up service; extracting information related to the application service associated with the area address from the response; and responding to the originator of the request by transferring said information to the originator.

The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holl, Gregg, Murphy, and Dinker with receiving a response from the second paper look-up service; extracting information related to the application service associated with the area address from the response; and responding to the originator of the request by transferring said information to the originator. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings with one another so a faster/more efficient system can be used without having to return an error message to the user in case the first server cannot supply the user/requestor with what they were requesting.

12. With respect to claim 7, Holl discloses including determining that the originator is a digital device of the kind which is arranged to detect positions of the position coded surface, or a network connection unit in communication with such a digital device, which digital device is registered by the first enterprise paper look-up service (pg. 4, [0002],

[0003]).

13. With respect to claim 8, the examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate the teachings of Holl, Gregg, Murphy and Dinker with that the originator is another enterprise paper look-up service. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these teachings with one another so a more efficient system can be built since it is merely a design choice of whom the originator can be.

14. With respect to claim 9, Holl discloses wherein the information includes a network address designating the application service (pg. 4, [0005], [0006]).

15. With respect to claim 10, Holl discloses wherein the network address is designated by means of a Uniform Resource Locator (pg. 4, [0005], [0006]).

16. With respect to claim 11, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Gregg discloses wherein the information includes designations of mandatory data that the application service requires access to during its execution ([0081], line 1-13, that if the session ID is not in the communication headers block, the client authenticator denies permission to the server application for servicing the account holder's request).

17. With respect to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Murphy discloses wherein the second paper look-up service is another paper look-up service (abstract). However, Holl, Gregg, Murphy, and Dinker do not clearly disclose that the second paper look-up service is an Enterprise lookup service. The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate the teachings of Holl, Gregg, Murphy and Dinker with wherein the second paper look-up service is another enterprise paper look-up service. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these teachings with one another so a more efficient system can be built since it is merely a design choice of what kind of paper lookup service the server is.

18. With respect to claim 13, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Murphy discloses wherein the second paper look-up service is another paper look-up service (abstract). However, Holl, Gregg, Murphy, and Dinker do not clearly disclose that the second paper look-up service is a global paper look-up service providing world wide services to enterprise paper look-up services operated by various organisations, such as enterprises or government authorities. The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate the teachings of Holl, Gregg, Murphy and Dinker with wherein the second paper look-up service is another enterprise paper look-up service. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these teachings with one another so a more efficient system can be built since it is merely a

design choice of what kind of paper lookup service the server is.

19. With respect to claim 14, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Murphy discloses that there are multiple Lookup servers linked to each other (abstract). However, Holl, Gregg, Murphy, and Dinker do not clearly wherein the first paper look-up service together with the second paper look-up service is included in a hierarchy of paper look-up services. The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made incorporate the teachings of Holl, Gregg, Murphy and Dinker with wherein the first paper look-up service together with the second paper look-up service is included in a hierarchy of paper look-up services. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these teachings with one another so a more efficient system can be built since it is merely a design choice of how the lookup services are linked together.

20. With respect to claims 16-28, the claimed subject matter is essentially the same as claims 1-14 and therefore is rejected for the same reasons above.

21. **Claims 15 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holl and in view of Gregg and in further view of Murphy and in further view of Dinker and in further view of official notice and in even further view of Bates et al. (US Patent # 6,643,824, hereinafter Bates).**

22. With respect to claim 15, Holl, Gregg, Murphy, and Dinker do not clearly disclose wherein the first enterprise paper look-up service performs the additional steps of: requesting a global paper look-up service to provide any template updates; and receiving a template update in response and extracting from the template update new management rules relating to at least one confined position coded surface area.

In the same field of endeavor, Bates discloses wherein the first enterprise paper look-up service performs the additional steps of: requesting a global paper look-up service to provide any template updates; and receiving a template update in response and extracting from the template update new management rules relating to at least one confined position coded surface area (col. 7, lines 34-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holl, Gregg, Murphy, and Dinker with the first enterprise paper look-up service performs the additional steps of: requesting a global paper look-up service to provide any template updates; and receiving a template update in response and extracting from the template update new management rules relating to at least one confined position coded surface area as taught in Bates in order to provide a correct input region. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings with one another in order to provide a more efficient system by ensuring a quick access to the link to be activated in response to a user operation performed while the pointer is disclosed within an input region.

23. With respect to claim 29, the claimed subject matter is essentially the same as claim 15 and therefore is rejected for the same reasons above.

Conclusion

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HO SHIU whose telephone number is (571)270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (8:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,236

Page 15

Art Unit: 2457

/ARIO ETIENNE/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457